APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,479	10/06/2000	Hidehiro Matsumoto	Q61026	8765

7590	08/18/2004

SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue N W
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER
CHUONG, TRUC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	15

DATE MAILED: 08/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/680,479	Applicant(s) MATSUMOTO, HIDEHIRO
	Examiner Truc T Chuong	Art Unit 2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 April 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-32* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _8_.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is responsive to Amendment B, filed 04/14/04.

2.   Claims 1-32 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, 18, 20, 22, and 27 are independent claims, and claim 2 is cancelled. This action is a non-final rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dozier et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,552) in view of Katz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,872 B1).

As to claim 1, Dozier teaches a terminal system comprising:

a server (WAN server, col. 3 line 50 and col. 4 line 10) operable to store text content (source document, col. 6 lines 42-52), and Dozier shows help content (suggested anchor items, col. 14 lines 24-42), wherein the help content includes specific information regarding how to retrieve or use the text content (e.g., col. 14 lines 29-53, and col. 13 line 50-col. 15 line 20); and

although in the System of Dozier, it does not clearly show that the private/personal computer (col. 6 lines 1-28) is a portable terminal, it is well known in the art and would have been obvious to implement the functions/features of the personal

computer into a general laptop/portable computer for the user's convenience; and the

portable terminal including a text browser (e.g., client computer, col. 6 lines 42-43, figs.

8a-b and 10a-d) operable to access and process the text content stored in said server (e.g.,

server, col. 3 line 50 and col. 4 line 10, col. 5 line 45 and 6 line 44), and a help browser

operable to process the help content stored in said server (e.g., col. 3 lines 50-67);

however, Dozier does not clearly show the help content automatically controls various

functions of the portable terminal to enable the user to more easily utilize the text content. Katz

clearly teaches desired tasks are automatically performed in response to triggering events, which

are automatically launched and controlled the GUI applications by only highlighting/displaying

some appropriate tasks guiding the user to complete the tasks (e.g., col. 5 lines 7-50, and figs. 2,

3A-B). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention, a person with ordinary skill in

the art would want to have the automated performing features of Katz in Dozier's template

editing system to enable the user to speed up the process by concentrating on the

accomplishment of goals, rather than focus upon how to use a computer (col. 2 lines 52-54).

As to claim 10, it is individual similar in scope to claim 1 above; therefore, rejected under

similar rationale.

5.   Claims 3-9, 11-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dozier

et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,552) in view of Katz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,872 B1), and

further in view of Pepe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,742,905).

As to claims 8, 9, 16, and 17, Dozier in view of Katz teaches that the portable terminal

(see claim 1 above) but does not clearly show the portable terminal can be a cellular phone and a

pager, and the PDA set to the effective state, said switch-key controlling means lights up light (or

vibrates) emitting sections (or buttons) corresponding to the switch keys being set to the effective

state. Pepe clearly teaches a cellular phone, PDA with all functions of a regular PDA (e.g., col. 5

lines 41-67) so the PDA can be set to the effective state, said switch-key controlling means lights

up light (or vibrates) emitting sections (or buttons) corresponding to the switch keys being set to

the effective state. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention, a person with

ordinary skill in the art would want to have Pepe's PDA with all features in the modified

Dozier's template editing system to provide services to users to communicate from anywhere to

anywhere at any time (col. 1 lines 36-39).

As to claims 30-32, they are similar in scope to claim 8 above; therefore, they can be

rejected under similar rationale.

As to claims 22 and 27, Dozier in view of Katz teaches a portable terminal

communication system comprising:

an information source server connected to a network and operable to separately store

target content and help content, wherein the help content is ancillary to the target content and is

provided to assist in retrieval of the target content and wherein the help content automatically

controls various functions of the portable terminal to enable the user to more easily utilize the

text content (see the rejection of claim 1 above and col. 15 line 1-col. 16 line 65); although,

Dozier also shows that a standard personal computer is being used to access/connect the Network

or the Internet in the invention (e.g., col. 1 lines 12-43) means a user's computer as mentioned

above could be a Laptop computer, a cellular phone, and PDA (it is well known in the art that

those devices could be communicated with others in both wireline and wireless connections).

However, the modified Dozier <u>does not specifically show</u> a wireless device, a radio gateway

server to connect both wireless and wireline network. Pepe clearly teaches a cellular phone, PDA

with using radio signal in communications (e.g., col. 5 lines 41-67, and col. 18 lines 7-28). It

would have been obvious at the time of the invention, a person with ordinary skill in the art

would want to have Pepe's radio signal, wireline, and wireless communications with all features

in Dozier's template editing system to provide services to users to communicate from anywhere

to anywhere at any time (e.g., col. 1 lines 36-39), and easy to access resources available in

different environments.

As to claims 25, 26, 28 and 29, they are similar in scope to claims 8 and 9. Note the

rejections of claims 8 and 9 above.

As to claims 3, 11, and 24, Dozier in view of Katz teaches a portable terminal to display

text content and help content on a browser (see claim 1 above); however, Dozier does not further

teach that the portable terminal further comprises a judging means for judging whether a

message inputted from outside belongs to a text message comprising the text content or a help

message comprising the help content, and activates either said text browser of said help browser

based on a result of judging means. Pepe clearly teaches the judging means for judging whether a

message belong to text content or help content (using segment IDs in message delivery and

notifications, col. 14 lines 53-67 and col. 15 lines 1-15). It would have been obvious at the time

of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art would add this highly desirable

judgment feature of Pepe's communication system in the modified Dozier so that the information

can be divided independently and uniquely (e.g., col. 14 lines 54-56).

As to claims 4 and 12, Dozier in view of Katz provides help browser outputs said help content as text, voice, static images, moving images (e.g., col. 1 lines 40-65, col. 13 line 50-col. 14 line 63 and figs. 4, 8a-b).

As to claim 18, it is a method claim that corresponds to the product of claims 10-11. Note the rejections of claims 10-11 above.

As to claim 19, it is a method claim that corresponds to the product of claim 12. Note the rejection of claim 12 above.

As to claim 20, it is a program product claim that corresponds to the product and method claims 10, 11, and 18. Note the rejections of claims 10, 11, and 18 above.

As to claim 21, it is a program product claim that corresponds to the product and method claims 12 and 19 above. Note the rejections of claims 12 and 19 above.

As to claims 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, and 23 Dozier in view of Katz provides a plurality of switch keys for use operations for using said text content, and switch-key controlling means for setting each of said plurality of switch keys to either an effective state or an ineffective state depending on the content of said help content (e.g., using icons, col. 4 lines 11-26).

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed in an Amendment B have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued the following:

a.   Dozier does not teach or suggest "suggest anchor items" that shows a method of utilizing or retrieving the text content.

b.   Dozier's anchor items is not the same as help content that show a method of

utilizing text content.

c.   Dozier does not disclose both the help content and text content are stored in the

server.

d.   Dozier does not show an information source server that can separately store both

target content as well as help content, wherein the help content is ancillary to target

content and is provided to assist in retrieval of the target content.

e.   Neither Dozier nor Pepe teaches judging whether an inputted message is a text

message or a help message, or activating either a text browser or a help browser based on

the result of the judgment.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Per (a) and (b), Dozier clearly teaches processing algorithms to generate automatically a

list of suggestions served as help content and then review the suggestions based on the provided

information served as text content (e.g., col. 13 line 50-col. 15 line 20).

Per (c), Dozier clearly teaches both text and help contents are stored in the server (col. 3

line 50-col. 4 line 10).

Per (d), Dozier clearly teaches a server for processing an appropriate message served as

help content to the application server, causing server software to initiate appropriate database

actions to get data from different database storages based on the input information served as text

content (col. 15 line 1-col. 16 line 65).

Per (e), Dozier clearly shows the judgment by automatically generating a list of

suggestions (help content) and then review the suggestions based on the provided information

(text content) (col. 13 line 50-col. 15 line 20); and processing an appropriate message to the

application server, causing server software to initiate appropriate database actions (col. 15 line 1-

col. 16 line 65) such as incorporating, modifying, or discarding the input information (col. 13

lines 60-67) by defining and comparing the input information (the provided information) with

the suggested anchor items (the list of suggestions) (col. 13 line 50-col. 14 line 62).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Truc T Chuong whose telephone number is 703-305-5753. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and alternate Fridays 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Truc T. Chuong

08/06/04

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER